



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/689,253

10/20/2003

Randall E. Juenger

DC-05519

3858

7590 09/14/2007
Robert W. Holland
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP
PO Box 203518
Austin, TX 78720

EXAMINER

SPITTLE, MATTHEW D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2111

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/689,253

Applicant(s)

JUENGER, RANDALL E.

Examiner

Matthew D. Spittle

Art Unit

2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1 – 22 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

5 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

10 (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 15
1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
- 20 obviousness or nonobviousness.

25 Claims 1 – 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2) in view of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212), with evidence provided by Digital Tigers SideCar PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide (hereafter referred to as DT4) and in view of was old and well known in the art.

Examiner notes that the publishing date of the DT4 reference does not meet 35 USC 102 requirements, however, DT2 does. DT4 is cited for providing more detailed information about the DT2 product. Since both describe the same product(s), the entire DT4 disclosure is presumed to be inherent in the DT2 reference.

30 Regarding claim 1, DT2 teach (using the DT4 User Guide) an information
handling system comprising:

 A housing (p. 3, see notebook computer housing);

 Processing components disposed in the housing and operable to generate
display information. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in this
35 art for notebook computers to have processing components which are disposed in the
housing and operable to generate display information. Therefore, it would have been
obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to house the processing components of the
notebook computer within the notebook computer housing, since to do so is routine in
this art;

40 A graphics component interfaced with the processing components and operable
to output the display information as a DVO signal. Examiner takes Official Notice that it
is old and well known in this art for a notebook computer as disclosed to output display
information, particularly as a DVO signal, since DVO signals provide a higher quality
display (p. 13, see Digital DVI). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of
45 ordinary skill in the art to utilize output display information on the notebook computer,
since to do so is routine in this art;

 A selector interfaced with the graphics component to receive the DVO signal
having first and second selectable outputs (Examiner notes that the software allows the
outputs to be selected for use; p. 43, see "Checkbox: "Extend my Windows desktop...";

50 A first DVI connector operable to provide the DVI output at the housing to an
external display (p. 3, Notebook external monitor cable). Examiner takes Official Notice

that it is well known for a notebook computer to have a DVI connector which attaches to a monitor cable for the purpose of providing a means of connecting the two. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a DVI connector
55 for the purpose of connecting a notebook computer to a cable, since to do so is routine in this art;

A docking connector operable to provide the DVI output at the housing to a docking station (where the docking connector is interpreted as a PC card connector; p. 16).

60 DT2 fails to teach a first and second TMDS transmitter.

Acharya et al. teach that TMDS transmission is well-known for use with flat panel displays, and allows fewer wires to be used for image data lower power consumption, better protection against EMI, and higher transmission speeds (col. 12, line 59 – col. 13, line 5).

65 Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by Applicant to incorporate the TMDS transmitters of Acharya et al. into the system of DT2 for the purpose of providing image data with fewer wires, lower power consumption, better protection against EMI, and higher transmission speeds. This would have been obvious to improve performance and make the system more
70 reliable.

Thus, all of the elements of claim 1 are taught by the combination of references, or obvious in view of what was old and well known in the art.

Regarding claim 2, DT2 teach (using the DT4 User Guide) the additional
75 limitation of a docking station operable to couple to the housing and to accept the
docking connector (where a docking station is interpreted as the combination of the
Notebook/Sidecar PC Card interface cable and the SideCar PlusTwo unit; p. 3);

A second DVI connector interfaced with the docking connector and operable to
provide the DVI output at the docking station to an external display (p.3, SideCar
80 monitor cables). Examiner notes that the display port is provided with a DVI connector
for use with supplied mating cables (See DT2, page 2, section "Display ports/adapters").

Regarding claim 3, DT2 teach (using the DT4 User Guide) the additional
limitation comprising:

85 A docking station detector operable to determine inserting of the information
handling system into the docking station (p. 24 – 28);

A switch interfaced with the docking station detector and the selector and
operable to select the first TMDS transmitter if the housing is not coupled to the docking
station and to select the second TMDS transmitter if the housing is coupled to the
90 docking station (Examiner notes that the software allows the outputs to be selected for
use; p. 43, see "Checkbox: "Extend my Windows desktop...""; This means would
appear to allow any monitor coupled externally to the notebook computer to be selected
and de-selected, whether or not the housing is coupled to the SideCar (docking
station)).

Regarding claim 8, DT2 teach (using the DT4 User Guide) the additional limitation comprising a display monitor operable to interface with the second DVI connector to present the display information when the housing is coupled to the docking station (p. 3, see monitor #3).

100

* * *

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2) in view
105 of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212), with evidence provided by Digital Tigers SideCar PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide (hereafter referred to as DT4) and Barlow et al. (U.S. 6,311,263) and what was old and well known in the art.

Regarding claim 4, DT2 fails to explicitly teach wherein the selector and the first and second TMDS transmitters are fabricated as an application specific integrated
110 circuit. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in this art to use an ASIC to implement some logic function as evidenced by Barlow et al. (col. 20, lines 57 – 63), since ASIC devices are low cost and have low power consumption, and thus, such would have been obvious to employ in combination with the prior art.

115

* * *

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2) in view of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212), with evidence provided by Digital Tigers SideCar PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide (hereafter referred to as DT4) and Merkin et al. (U.S. 6,584,561) and what was old and well known in the art.

Regarding claim 5, DT2 fails to explicitly teach wherein the graphics component comprises a graphics and memory controller hub. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in this art for a computer system, such as a notebook computer, to contain a graphics and memory controller hub, as evidenced by Merkin et al. (col. 3, lines 38 – 42), and thus, such would have been obvious to employ in combination with the prior art.

Regarding claim 6, DT2 fails to explicitly teach wherein the graphics component comprises a graphics processor unit. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in this art for a computer system, such as a notebook computer, to contain a graphics processor unit, as evidenced by Merkin et al. (col. 3, lines 38 – 42; Fig. 1, 130), and thus, such would have been obvious to employ in combination with the prior art.

* * *

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2) in view of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212), with evidence provided by Digital Tigers SideCar

PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide (hereafter referred to as DT4) and Merrill (U.S.
140 Pub. 2002/0036694) and what was old and well known in the art.

Regarding claim 7, DT2 fails to explicitly teach a projector. Examiner takes
Official Notice that it is old and well known in this art to use a projector with a DVI
connector for the purposes of presenting display information. This is evidenced by
Merrill (par. 116), and thus, such would have been obvious to employ in combination
145 with the prior art.

* * *

Claims 9 – 22 are directed to a method and a system with substantially similar
limitations as in claims 1 – 8 above and are rejected under the same grounds.

150 ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 6/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are
not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument that the references fail to teach a docking
station, Examiner points to page 3 of the Digital Tiger reference, which shows the
155 combination of the **Notebook/Sidecar PC Card interface cable** and the **SideCar
PlusTwo** unit. These elements encompass the "docking station" as claimed, since they
do indeed dock with the notebook computer housing.

Regarding Applicant's argument that the references do not teach a docking
connector, Examiner points to the PC Card connector on page 16. This element could
160 be called a "docking connector" since it permits the "docking station", as previously

Art Unit: 2111

described, to be docked with the notebook computer housing. The word "docked" is given its broadest reasonable interpretation, such as to mean, "joined."

Additionally, Applicant has merely argued that the docking station and docking connector of the reference are not the same as that of the claimed invention. These arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references, or how the references are different.

Thus, the Examiner cannot allow the claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew D. Spittle whose telephone number is (571) 272-2467. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8 - 4:30.

185 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on 571-272-3632. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
190 published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
195 USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


MDS


MARK H. RINEHART
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100